

**CLARK COUNTY  
CLEAN WATER COMMISSION  
Meeting Notes**

Wednesday, March 21, 2001  
6:00 – 6:30 PM

Clark County Public Works Department  
Conference Room  
4700 NE 78<sup>th</sup> Street  
Vancouver, Washington  
**Amended**

---

**Call to Order**

*Roll Call:*

Clark County Clean Water Commission Members Present

Willie Bourlet, Cal Ek, Dana Kemper, Susan Rasmussen,  
Don Steinke, Art Stubbs *and Peter Tuck*

Clark County Clean Water Commission Members Excused Absence

*Mary Martin*

Clark County Public Works Staff

Kelli Frost, and Earl Rowell

Public

Vaughn Brown, Jeanne Lawson Associates

*Introduction:*

The members of the Clark County Clean Water Commission, Clark County staff, and public were introduced. Chair, Commissioner Kemper, then called the meeting to order.

*Agenda and material review:*

The material for tonight's meeting include:

1. 3/21/01 Agenda;
2. 3/07/01 Clark County Clean Water Commission Meeting notes;
3. E-mail from public providing a suggestion for the incentive program;
4. Letters to Mrs. Meats from school children who attended a River Rangers program;
5. Updated address list of Clark County Clean Water Commissioners and a list of Clark County contacts; and
6. A copy of the March newsletter Greenlines, published by Environmental Information Cooperative.

*Updates/Communications from the public/media/agencies:*

Mr. Bourlet: I have a comment regarding the ESA; "For the record, this says that the reason that the Chinook are running so good in the Columbia River is because they are going to a tributary that goes to the Hanford nuclear facility, and there has been no development there. This implies that if you don't have any development you have good fish run. I'd like for the record to show that the State of Washington killed the natural fish in as many rivers as possible because they thought the hatchery fish were going to do so much better. The State of Washington created a problem; it's not because the nuclear site in Eastern Washington doesn't have development.

Mr. Ek: One point I'd like to make is that the Hanford reach is not a tributary.

Mr. Kemper asked Mrs. Rasmussen to give the Clark County Clean Water Commissioners an update on the SWRP program.

Mrs. Rasmussen passed around a document that Mrs. Renfro uses in her masters class program, which teaches teachers how to test and monitor water with students. Mrs. Renfro's program has been in existence since 1991 and she works out of the Oregon Graduate Institute. Mrs. Renfro seems genuinely interested in working with us and is interested in attending one of our meetings to speak and answer any questions we might have.

Mr. Kemper noted that three of the questions the Commissioners will have to look at are:

1. How can this be useful to the Clark County Clean Water Commission?
2. How can we implement this into our program?
3. Can this be used as part of the two Centennial grants that the County applied for?

Mr. Bourlet: We keep hearing that the water in Clark County is dirty. Yet, no one can show data to back up that claim. When we asked Rusty Post from Washington Department of Ecology, how many outfalls there were in Clark County, he didn't know, and they were never tested. I would like the Clark County Clean Water Commission to ask Mrs. Renfro and Mr. Akers to come before this Commission and tell us about what they do before the County buys some elaborate equipment. My concern is that the County is going to waste taxpayers dollars.

Mr. Agard: I agree with Mr. Bourlet, they have a program that is already established that we may be able to incorporate into the education and/or testing section of the budget.

Mr. Tuck requested a copy of the two Centennial grant applications.

Mr. Rowell: We will contact Mrs. Renfro and ask her when she is available to give a presentation to this Commission. Mr. Rupley and Mr. Tyler from the ESA program are scheduled to give a presentation at the April 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

*3/07/01 meeting notes:*

The notes for the Clark County Clean Water Commission were approved with the following corrections:

Mrs. Rasmussen: I would like it noted why I voted no to Mr. Steinke's proposal. Mr. Steinke had good intentions but I feel like there is a segment of our society that's being segregated out in these buffer zones and I believe that any kind of segregation is wrong.

**Motion: 2001-0307-03 Proposal for the Clean Water Commissioners to take a position on shoreline protection and notify our legislators and County Commissioners of our position.**

*Motion withdrawn (not tabled as indicated in the 3/07/01 minutes)*

*Spring Break schedule for the Commissioners:*

It was noted that most of the schools in the Clark County area will be on spring break during the week of April 2<sup>nd</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> 2001, the Commissioners were asked if they would be available to attend the regularly scheduled meeting on Wednesday, April 4<sup>th</sup> 2001. Mr. Kemper confirmed that he would be out of town during that week and would not be able to attend the meeting.

## **Public Input**

There was no public input.

## **Group Discussion**

*Annual Report wrap up:*

Mr. Kemper: Were there any other items that needed to be brought forward regarding the annual report?

Mr. Bourlet: Can you add that a contractor fee takes care of inspections?

Mr. Kemper: I will include in the cover letter a note to the Commissioners pertaining to inspectors being properly allocated to each department. Can everyone give me their ideas regarding the cover letter to the Board of County Commissioners?

*Potential Clean Water Ordinance (CCC 13.30A) modifications:*

Mr. Agard: On the first page line 18 and 19, I think we ought to strike out *new additional*, because this is going to be an ordinance that will stand for many years and every year we will be getting a new NPDES permit, and that permit requires us to undertake activities not necessarily *new additional* activities.

Mr. Kemper: The NPDES permit requires that the only portion the Clark County Clean Water Commission can pay for is those areas that are new and additional.

It was decided to leave in the words *new additional* on lines 18-19 page one.

Mr. Stubbs: Can we accept any changes by consent vote without voting on each one.

Mr. Kemper: We will go with majority vote when making changes today and then by consent vote on the final draft.

Mr. Agard: Under definitions exhibit A, line 7 and 10 we have yards listed as impervious surface, I believe the state is dropping yards and grassy areas out of their definition of impervious surface.

Mr. Rowell: This definition is taken from the Puget Sound 1992 manual and I believe it is consistent with the Western Washington year 2000 manual.

Mr. Agard: I would suggest that we leave it out and ask the Board of County Commissioners look at it and they can leave it in if they feel that there is a legal issue.

Mr. Kemper: Mr. Rowell can you check to see if there has been a language change regarding the definition of impervious surface?

Mr. Ek: I think if you put the word impervious in front of surfaces and impervious in front of yards then it would make more sense.

Mr. Kemper: We will include the word *impervious* before yards.

Mr. Rowell: If you have additional modifications you would like to make please let me know. The next draft will include a footnote of who is requesting each modification.

Mr. Ek: Is there a need to get this ordinance out in a publishable format before we get the incentives identified?

Mr. Rowell: Not necessarily, it would be nice to have the incentives identified so we know which modifications you want to have in the ordinance.

## **Incentives**

### *Ground Rules:*

Mr. Brown explained to the Commissioners that they would need to adopt, as a Committee, the operating procedures for the upcoming work session(s).

Mr. Brown provided a handout that outlined some draft ground rules, which were established by Mr. Kemper, Mr. Rowell and Mr. Brown. He went on to explain that the ground rules for the work sessions were to try and keep the meetings organized and efficient.

**Mr. Agard: Motion: 2001-0321-05 Move to accept the draft ground rules as submitted.**

**Mr. Steinke: Second the motion.**

**Motion 2001-0321-05 passed.**

## **Adjourn**

Mr. Kemper adjourned the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

## **Looking Ahead**

April 4:	Presentation from Ms. Renfro of SWRP
April 18:	Presentation from Mr. Rupley and Mr. Tyler of the ESA program.
Late April:	Work Session with Board of County Commissioners.
June:	Clean Water Fee bills mailed.
July:	Clean Water Fee bills due.
September:	Begin work on 2003-2004 budget